

### Remarks

As discussed below, Applicant submits that the prior art rejections cannot be maintained because none of the cited references corresponds to the claimed invention. In addition, Applicant maintains that the § 112 rejections are improper; however, the § 112 rejections are rendered moot by the above presented amendments.

In the Final Office Action dated October 3, 2008, the following rejections are presented: claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(1); claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2); claims 1-10 and 21-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the Haberman reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,417,075); claims 1-2, 4-10, 21-22 and 25-28 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 102(b) over the Schrantz reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,552,345); claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-10, 21-22 and 25-28 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 102(a) and § 102(e) over the Chong reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,544,863); claims 9 and 28 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Haberman reference; and claims 3, 7-9, 23 and 28 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Chong reference. Applicant traverses all of the rejections and, unless explicitly stated by the Applicant, does not acquiesce to any objection, rejection or averment made in the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully submits that the various § 102 and § 103(a) rejections of claims 1-10 and 21-28 cannot be maintained because the cited references do not correspond to various aspects of the claimed invention. The following discussion particularly addresses each of the cited references.

Regarding the '075 reference, the cited portions of this reference do not correspond to aspects of the claimed invention directed to a carrier having a surface and pillar extensions that extend from the surface, with the pillar extensions having rounded corners that meet the surface of the carrier. For example, the cited portions of the '075 reference do not teach that wafer 2 has pillar extensions that have round corners that meet the surface of the wafer 2. *See, e.g.*, Figs. 1a and 2a, and Col. 4:40-53 (cited by the Examiner). As such, the § 102 and § 103(a) rejections based on the '075 reference are improper and cannot be maintained.

Regarding the '345 reference, the cited portions of this reference do not correspond to aspects of the claimed invention directed to a carrier having a surface and pillar extensions that extend from the surface. For example, the cited portions of the '345

reference do not teach that substrate 2 (*i.e.*, the Examiner's alleged carrier) has pillar extensions that extend from the surface of the substrate 2. *See, e.g.*, Figs. 2a-2c and 4c-4e. In addition, the cited portions of the '345 reference also do not teach pillar structures that extend from the pillar extensions of the carrier to a surface of a first layer as in the claimed invention. Thus, the § 102 rejections based on the '345 reference cannot be maintained and Applicant requests that they be withdrawn.

Regarding the '863 reference, the cited portions of this reference do not correspond to aspects of the claimed invention directed to a carrier having a surface and pillar extensions that extend from the surface. For example, the cited portions of the '863 reference do not teach that substrate layer 201 (*i.e.*, the Examiner's alleged carrier) has pillar extensions that extend from the surface of the substrate layer 201. *See, e.g.*, Figs. 2b-2e. In addition, the cited portions of the '863 reference also do not teach pillar structures that extend from the pillar extensions of the carrier to a surface of a first layer as in the claimed invention. Therefore, the § 102 and § 103(a) rejections based on the '863 reference are improper and cannot be maintained.

In view of the above, the § 102 and § 103(a) rejections of claims 1-10 and 21-28 cannot be maintained and Applicant requests that they be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections/objections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilski, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063.

*Please direct all correspondence to:*

Corporate Patent Counsel  
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards  
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41  
San Jose, CA 95131  
CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford  
Reg. No.: 32,122  
(NXPS.513PA)